Remarks

Claims 32 and 39-43 are presently pending. No claims are currently amended, and no new claims are added.

Claim Objections

Claim 38 was objected to as being withdrawn in response to the election of species requirement filed September 20, 2007. Applicant has amended the claim label to reflect its status as "withdrawn." Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the claim objections.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Tuyl in view of Spivey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,886,353 – hereinafter "Spivey"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this position.

Claim 32 recites, *inter alia*, "receiving a plurality of pixel signal values for each of a plurality of calibration images captured by an imager, creating an average interpolation function to produce interpolated average signal values for the imager, and creating an interpolation function for each pixel to produce interpolated signal values for the pixel." Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Tuyl, nor Spivey, nor their combination teaches or suggests or otherwise renders obvious at least these recited elements of claim 32.

As the Office Action highlights (page 3), Spivey appears to discuss forming a calibration frame (col. 15, line 30), correcting defective pixels in the calibration image by interpolation of nearest neighbors (col. 15, line 35), and averaging pixel values in the calibration image to store a single mean value (col. 15, lines 40-41). However, Spivey does not appear to have anything to

do with "receiving a plurality of pixel signal values for each of a plurality of calibration images captured by an imager," or "creating an average interpolation function to produce interpolated average signal values for the imager" or "creating an interpolation function for each pixel to produce interpolated signal values for the pixel." Instead, Spivey appears to discuss the creation of only "one calibration frame" (col. 15, line 30), so Spivey does not teach or suggest "receiving a **plurality** of pixel signal values for each of a **plurality** of calibration images captured by an imager." Further, Spivey does not teach or suggest "creating an interpolation function **for each pixel** to produce interpolated signal values **for the pixel**," rather, Spivey appears to discuss only interpolating for each *defective* pixel of the *one* calibration frame by using its nearest neighbors (col. 15, lines 34-37). Finally, storing a "single mean value" (col. 15, lines 40-41) for the average pixel values in the *single* calibration image does not appear to be related to "creating an interpolation function **for each pixel** to produce interpolated signal values **for the pixel**."

For at least these reasons, Spivey does not teach or suggest or otherwise render obvious at least the aforementioned elements of claim 32. Tuyl fails to supply at least these elements which Spivey lacks (Office Action page 3). Therefore, claim 32 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 39-44, which properly depend from claim 32 and contain all the limitations of claim 32, are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons described with respect to claim 32.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, all of the claims remaining in this application should now be seen to be in condition for allowance. A prompt notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. If there are any remaining questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

FAEGRE & BENSON LLP

By: /Benjamin S. Fernandez/
Benjamin S. Fernandez
Reg. No. 55,172
(303) 607-3709
Customer No.: 35657

Dated: March 4, 2009